

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

MARCUS QUINN, #180092,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 2:20-cv-339-MHT-SMD
	)	[WO]
ROBERT HENLINE, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

*Pro se* Plaintiff Marcus Quinn filed this action on May 22, 2020. (Doc. 1). Defendants have since filed an answer, a written report, a supplemental written report, and supporting evidentiary materials denying Plaintiff's allegations. (Docs. 13, 16) On October 26, 2020, the Court instructed Plaintiff to file a response to Defendants' materials on or before November 16, 2020. (Doc. 17) p. 2. The Court cautioned Plaintiff that his failure to file a response would result in a recommendation that this case be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *Id.* To date, Plaintiff has not filed a response to Defendants' materials or otherwise complied with the Court's October 26, 2020 order.

A federal district court has the inherent power to dismiss a case *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or obey a court order. *See, e.g., Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–30 (1962); FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b). The Eleventh Circuit has made clear that "dismissal is warranted only upon a 'clear record of delay or willful contempt and a finding that lesser sanctions would not suffice.'" *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989) (per curiam) (emphasis omitted) (quoting *Goforth v. Owens*, 766 F.2d

1533, 1535 (11th Cir. 1985)). Here, the undersigned finds that Plaintiff has willfully failed to file a response in compliance with the Court's October 26, 2020 order. And considering Plaintiff's disregard for orders of this Court, the undersigned further finds that sanctions lesser than dismissal would not suffice in this case.

Accordingly, the undersigned Magistrate Judge RECOMMENDS that this case be DISMISSED without prejudice.

It is further ORDERED that the parties shall file any objections to this Recommendation on or before **February 26, 2021**. A party must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which each objection is made; frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered. Failure to file written objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) shall bar a party from a de novo determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation, and waives the right of the party to challenge on appeal the District Court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982); 11TH CIR. R. 3-1; *see also Stein v. Lanning Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982); *Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc).

DONE this 12th day of February, 2021.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen M. Doyle", written over a horizontal line.

Stephen M. Doyle  
CHIEF U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE